



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,726	02/25/2002	Kenneth J. Newell	USA.286-1	2018

7590 01/16/2004
Ralph D' Alessandro
3D Systems, Inc.
26081 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355

EXAMINER

TENTONI, LEO B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/084,726

Applicant(s)

NEWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Leo B. Tentoni

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 02/25/2002;
10/23/2002
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-8 and 11-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8, 11, 13-15 and 42-44 of copending Application No. 09/970,727. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because providing a temperature controllable environment having an initial temperature above the melting point of the non-curable phase change composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to melt the support structure; holding the temperature of the controllable environment above the melting point of the non-curable phase change composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1732

skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to melt and remove the support structure; lowering the temperature of the object at a rate wherein a temperature differential within regions of the object does not exceed about 5°C would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to avoid imparting additional stresses and strains onto the object.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-8 and 11-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-23, 26, 28-30 and 45-47 of copending Application No. 09/970,727. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because providing a temperature controllable environment having an initial temperature above the melting point of the non-curable phase change composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to melt the support structure; holding the temperature of the controllable environment above the melting point of the non-curable phase change composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to melt and remove the support structure; lowering the temperature of the object at a rate wherein the temperature of

Art Unit: 1732

the regions of the object remain substantially equal would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to avoid imparting additional stresses and strains onto the object.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-8 and 11-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-38, 40, 41 and 48-50 of copending Application No. 09/970,727. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because providing a temperature controllable environment having an initial temperature above the melting point of the non-curable phase change composition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to melt the support structure; holding the temperature of the controllable environment just above the freezing point of the phase change component until the temperature of all of the regions of the object substantially equalize would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made principally in order to avoid imparting additional stresses and strains onto the object.

Art Unit: 1732

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 16-27 are allowable over the prior art references presently of record.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior art references, alone or in combination, disclose, suggest or teach a process of post processing an article formed by solid freeform fabrication to remove a support structure including the step of submersing an article in a fluid medium in a temperature controllable environment at a temperature above the melting point of the phase change component, the phase change component being at least partially soluble in the fluid medium as set forth in instant independent claim 16.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo B. Tentoni whose telephone number is (571) 272-1209. The examiner

Art Unit: 1732

can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30 A.M. - 3:00 P.M.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0987.

Leo B. Tentoni

Leo B. Tentoni
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

lbt